

REMARKS

Claims 2, 7, 9, 14, 16 and 21 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims were rejected. Claims 2, 7, 9, 14, 16 and 21 are currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 9 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jaszewski. However, the external indication of signal strength of nearby access points according to Jaszewski is at best only indirectly provided by the access point, and in a manner which tends to be quite inconvenient in the real world. According to Jaszewski, the AP provides an indication to a network manager (110), where it can be viewed on a monitor.¹ When installing a new AP in an existing WLAN, particularly a large or complex WLAN, or one that overlaps with other WLANs, it is inconvenient for the installer to move back and forth between the AP and a network manager workstation. Typically, the AP and the network manager are not in close proximity so the installer must walk between the two devices each time the AP is moved to a potential location. Similarly, the installer typically does not wish to study or maintain a floor plan layout of where other APs have been located. In the case where there are neighboring APs owned by others, it may not even be practical to have such a floor plan. The presently claimed invention helps to solve these problems by having the AP itself provide an external indication directly to the installer. For example, the AP may show a flashing light, buzzer, or other signal so that the installer can physically walk around with the AP until the best mounting position is found, without any need to view the network manager monitor. Claims 2, 9 and 16 have been amended to emphasize that the indication is directly from the AP to the installer. For example, claim 2 recites “an indicator operable to provide an external indication of the signal strength

directly from the first access point to a human being, the indication being perceivable by the human being and also being indicative of the signal strength of the second access point.”

(emphasis added) Withdrawal of the rejections is therefore requested.

Claims 7, 14 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Jaszewski in view of Halasz. The cited combination might produce an AP which searches for a channel with low interference, but the claimed invention is not that simple. The Office should note that each of claims 7, 14 and 21 recite either a step or logic for reducing transmission power. In a crowded environment where all available channels are utilized (or have interference from other sources) it is insufficient to simply select the channel with the lowest power from a neighboring AP because that may cause significant interference. The presently claimed invention helps solve this problem by reducing transmission power, a limitation which Applicant is unable to find anywhere in the cited references. Claim 7 therefore distinguishes the cited combination by reciting “logic for reducing transmission power.” Claims 14 and 21 recite similar language. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore requested.

Claims 7, 14 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for being indefinite. The claims have been amended accordingly to overcome the rejection.

¹ Figure 4 and column 9, line 60 through column 10, line 2

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

August 2, 2006
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/
Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 160-007
Dd: 9/8/06